



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

1914, declared that one of the ends we must all keep in view is "the substitution for force, for the clash of competing ambition, for groupings and alliances and a precarious equipoise, of a real European partnership based on the recognition of equal right and established and enforced by a common will."

EDITORIAL NOTES

Universities and the War

At the recent opening of the Leeds University Medical School, England, Sir William Osler, Regius Professor of Medicine at Oxford, referred to the present war as "a periodic attack of acute mania on the part of the race." Sir William, not unknown to Americans, believes that the young men of England have been trained to regard warfare as one of the prerogatives of Jehovah. He said: "The pride, pomp, and circumstance of war have so captivated the human mind that its horrors are deliberately minimized. The soldier embodies the heroic virtues, and the camp is the nursery of fortitude and chivalry. The inspiration of the nation is its battles."

The explanation of this, he believes, lies in the fact that we are in the childhood of civilization, the lust of war is still in the blood. There seems to be no final appeal but to the ordeal of battle. "Some of us," he said, "had indulged the fond hope that in the power man had gained over nature had arisen possibilities for intellectual and social development such as to control collectively his morals and emotions, so that the nations would not learn war any more. We were foolish enough to think that where Christianity had failed science might succeed, forgetting that the hopelessness of the failure of the gospel lay not in the message, but in its interpretation. The promised peace was for the individual—the world was to have tribulations." He declared that organized knowledge must infiltrate every activity of human life. There is a difficulty in those islands which in fruitful ideas, inventions, and discoveries has had the lion's share, but failed to grasp immediately their practical importance. The leaders of intellectual and political thought were not awake when the dawn appeared. The oligarchy who ruled politically were ignorant; the hierarchy who ruled intellectually were hostile. In two ways science is the best friend war ever had: it has made slaughter possible on a scale undreamt of, and it has enormously increased man's capacity to maim and to disable his fellow-man. Sir William believes that in the present war at least five or six millions of men in the prime of life will be killed.

As against science's contribution to war, the distinguished physician believes that there is a great credit balance—the enormous number spared the misery of

sickness, unspeakable tortures saved by anæsthesia, the lessened time of convalescence, the whole organization of nursing.

Dr. M. E. Sadler, Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University, pointed out that the universities of Göttingen, Heidelberg, and Berlin have had a great deal to do with bringing on the war. He expressed the feeling also that British universities had neglected scientific interests and methods in the training of young men who had passed on to high positions in the civil service. He added: "If Oxford had cared more for the study of the humanities and dialectics, we might have had in our civil service and government men who were so alert to the real drift of things and so alive to the possibilities of the destructive power of science that they in trumpet tones might have aroused their countrymen and prevented this war."

Our personal opinion is that the failure of the universities is only one aspect of the more colossal failure of our total human collective effort to establish international machinery for the realization of simple justice.

The Program of the Peace Congress.

We are glad to call attention to the program of the Fifth American Peace Congress recently held in San Francisco. It is printed, as it was actually passed by the Congress, elsewhere in these pages. It is not exactly the program we would have devised. It contains too many paragraphs. We do not believe that paragraph V is founded upon fact. We have little faith that the nations now at war would look with any favor upon any possible suggestions from neutrals looking toward the end of the war. We are of the opinion that paragraph VI presents a plan which is impracticable.

There are valuable features, however, which will help. It is true that the President of the United States is deserving of credit for keeping this country out of the war. "Costly preparation against hypothetical dangers" is a felicitous and illuminating phrase. It seems proper that the recipients of special privilege should be reminded of the proprieties relative to representation upon the committees of Congress. The indictment against war is pertinent and powerful. The program of the League to Enforce Peace, especially in section 3, has been greatly improved.

It was well to re-emphasize our hope in the Third Hague Conference. Pan-American co-operation in the Mexican situation is deservedly mentioned. The merging of the Monroe Doctrine in a League of Pan-American Peace is not so clear. The references to our immigration policy and to women, while important enough, seem in the light of our main problem relatively insignificant. The paragraph referring to universities and

colleges might well have included the rest of our schools. The call to avoid the militarization of our country would have been stronger had it been more clearly defined.

The program as a whole, as it seems to us, is representative of the best thought now bearing upon our distressing world situation.

**International
Unions for the
Advancement
of Science.**

Through the development of international unions for the advancement of science is to come a finer world organization for international peace. This was the view held by Prof. Paul S. Reinsch, minister to China, expressed in an address at the University of Chicago a short time ago. Professor Reinsch was speaking on "The Hague Tribunal and the Future Development of International Peace." Among other things he declared:

"Modern science and the demand for standardized efficiency work increasingly for international action. We, therefore, have the basis of a juristic union to develop a law to bind nations in a practical way, leaving each free to express national feeling in art, literature, and music.

"There can be produced an international state, strong in its use of the information of the world for practical affairs. It is very interesting that in this America is fitted to take a leading part."

International organization is the hope of the peace movement. The differences of opinion with reference to the peace movement relate almost entirely to the question, What direction shall this organization take? It must, we believe, be an outgrowth of the organizations which already exist. Professor Reinsch does us a service in calling attention to the possibilities presented by the international scientific organizations. The contribution of the scientists to the juridical union of the nations will necessarily be very great.

**"Preparedness"
and a Petition.**

The following petition prepared by some of our friends in California expresses our views so clearly relative to the problem of preparedness that we are glad to print it in full. It reads:

Hon....., M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas our Republic began all its foreign wars and never has been attacked, and cannot possibly be attacked until some time after the exhausted powers shall end the present war; and as our friendship with the great world powers, our extensive commerce with all nations, and our protection by two oceans render us the safest of all nations and the natural leader of the world to peace; and whereas other nations would regard our preparations for war as an example and even a real danger to them; and because the other nations would in

like manner increase their armaments, and thus leave our country no stronger, relatively, than before, I therefore petition our government to consider the following protest:

Let Law Replace War.—I protest against the war system which has amassed the huge armaments that are desolating civilization. I urge that the Congress may not be stampeded by those crying hysterically for extravagant increases in our military preparations, but that that body may promote those measures which shall lead to arbitration, to a Congress and High Court of Nations, destined as they surely are to replace the rival armies and navies of the world. Let us prepare for what we want—Peace.

Name

Address

**College Men
at the Front.**

It seems appropriate to assume that college men are representative of the nations' best stock. If this be true, the present war is working a most distressing havoc in the best blood of the nations at war. Upon the authority of Dr. M. R. James, the Provost of King's College, Cambridge University, England, that illustrious university has shrunk to less than one-third of its former numbers. Figures show that shrinkage in tuitions has made it necessary for the university to practice a most rigid economy, and the financial prospect for 1915 "cannot but be gloomy." Of Cambridge men, not less than 10,000 are fighting or preparing to fight for the defense of their country; some seven hundred have been wounded, and over three hundred have won distinctions in the field. The Provost says: "We know, too, that of the whole number between two and three thousand would, in the ordinary course, still be living and studying among us." He adds: "We pass to the thought of the many who will not return; 470 Cambridge men have fallen; 150 of them at least should have been undergraduates still. For these no privileges we can devise avail, yet the university bears them upon her heart."

Mr. Robert Herrick, in the *New Republic* for October 30, recants as a pacifist because he is ashamed of our "vague pacifism," "anæmic idealism," "timidities," "unrealities," and "sickliness." Mr. Herrick has been in France. He says there is no question of the great benefit of this war to that country, sweeping away the trivial and the base, uniting all classes, and revealing the nation to itself in terms of chivalry, steadiness, seriousness, bravery, and good humor. Mr. Herrick lets slip one expression which may serve as our reply to him. He says: "It may be lamentable that humanity is so firmly in the grip of biologic law that it must kill in order to decide its disputes."

The answer to Mr. Herrick's mental difficulties is, however, more completely set forth in an editorial in the same number of the *New Republic*. The editorial is entitled "The Reality of Peace." It is an illuminating defense of the patent fact that there is no moral gain following in the wake of war which is not also possible to civilization at peace. The last sentence of this article reads: "America could have no nobler ideal than to show in its institutions the supreme reality of the pacifist state."

If we have spent fifteen billions of dollars in the last generation in war bills, two billions upon our navy in the last thirty years, are we now so unprepared that we must give way to the scaremongers and stampeders? If so, against whom must we extravagantly prepare? Is

it against the diminishing Germany, diminishing England, diminishing France? Is it against Mexico? Is it against Japan? If so, why?

The vital question soon to be decided by the people of the United States is, Shall the United States borrow money for a most unprecedented increase of unproductive armaments?

Is this country going into the attacking business? Is this country going to wage war against Japan, against Germany, against England, against France? If so, when, and what for?

The hysterical exponents of an extravagant additional military outlay owe to the American people a bill of particulars. And it ought to be explicit.

CRITICISMS OF THE PEACE SOCIETIES

BY CHARLES W. ELIOT

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE is interested to know what wise men think of it and of the work it aims to promote. When urged to write his views of what the peace societies might well do at this time, Dr. Eliot wrote to us the following letters, all but the personal parts of which are here given. Our reply will be found elsewhere in these pages.—THE EDITOR.

ASTICOU, MAINE, 11 September, 1915.

I am sorry to say that I do not feel able to write an article on "what the peace societies might well do," for I have no clear vision of what they might do now for the advantage of the civilized world. I can see no way of preventing war in the future, except through an agreement made by a moderate number of strong nations to prevent war by force, and the peace societies have opposed, and I believe still oppose, all such use of force. Do you see, or does President Burton or Secretary Trueblood see, clearly any other way to stop the competitive national arming and the fighting sure to result therefrom? If anybody has made you acquainted with a feasible plan for stopping competitive arming, will you kindly impart it to me?

Sincerely yours,
(Signed)

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

ASTICOU, MAINE, 16 September, 1915.

I cannot express more clearly my present frame of mind than I expressed it in my letter to you of September 11.

I am glad to hear that William Ladd's Essay of 1840 is to be reprinted and circulated. We shall be able to make a fresh comparison between his doctrine and the fighting spirit in Europe between 1864 and 1916.

I have read your ten objections to an International Police in the August ADVOCATE OF PEACE. They are not without force. The project of a world federation, a world court, and a world police is vast, and probably not feasible at present, or within any reasonable time. The smaller project of a limited league of a moderate

number of strong nations, which by treaty shall agree that they will each furnish a specified quota of military and naval force to be used in preventing any member of the league from going to war, and in preventing any nation outside of the league from attacking any member of the league, or in resisting such an attack, if it shall occur, is to be advocated on the ground that nobody has imagined and suggested any other way of reducing the competitive arming which has led to the present war, and will surely crush the nations of Europe under intolerable burdens if it goes on. It is easy to imagine objections to this limited scheme of co-operative defense against war and the competitive arming which surely leads to war; but it is also not impossible to imagine overcoming the objections. Therefore all men of good will ought to advocate this plan, unless they can propose another which is more feasible or more promising. To my thinking, the proposition of the peace societies that an international legislature and an international court be established, without providing any sanction for international law, is neither feasible nor promising. On the contrary, it seems to me absolutely hopeless and foolish. To advocate it is a complete waste of time, strength, and good intentions, and nothing but a prolongation of the present misery of Europe will result from the efforts of the peace societies in that direction. The officers and agents of the existing peace societies are taking, in my judgment, a very grave responsibility in persisting in policies which the experience of Europe since 1864 has shown to be wholly futile. There is no government and no court in the world which does not rest ultimately on force—force restrained and regulated, to be sure, but still effective force. International war will not be brought to an end without the use of a regulated, restrained, but effective force. So long as the peace societies and the peace promoters decline to recognize and act upon this obvious principle in government and law, they will only postpone the coming of international peace.